

Draft 2003 Triennial Review Issues for the Lahontan Region

(Issues are numbered for reference; numbers do not imply recommended priorities within High, Medium, and Low priority categories.)

Contact Judith Unsicker at (530) 542-5462 or JUnsicker@rb6s.swrcb.ca.gov if you have questions about this list.

Issue #	Proposed Priority	Issue	Estimated Resource Needs (PY) ¹	Comments
1	High	Revise waste discharge prohibition affecting piers in Lake Tahoe	0.6 PY	Schedule depends on completion of Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's revisions to its shorezone regulations.
2	High	Revise "percent sodium" standards for surface waters of Carson and Walker River watersheds	0.6 PY	Would modernize standards and avoid the need for TMDL ² development for sodium in the West Fork Carson River.
3	High	Update of entire Basin Plan including (1) editorial update to reflect new laws, regulations, policies and plans, with minor corrections/clarifications as needed, and (2) minor regulatory changes	1.5 PY	Regulatory changes could include addition of: specific authority to grant compliance schedules in NPDES ² permits; clarified interpretation of standards and effluent limitations in relation to waters with naturally poor quality; erosion control guidelines for the Truckee River watershed.
4	High	Water quality objective(s) based on narrative biocriteria for Sierra Nevada streams	0.6 PY	Data for development of objective(s) will be available by 2005.
5	High	Site-specific ammonia objectives for Paiute Ponds and Amargosa Creek (Los Angeles County)	1.0 PY	Consultants' study to develop draft objectives is now in progress.
6	High	New or revised water quality objectives for nutrients and related parameters for surface waters regionwide	1.0 PY	Objectives to be developed by a statewide interagency workgroup; schedule is uncertain. Planning staff time needed for continued workgroup participation over three years with more time probably needed in Year 3.
7	High	2006 Triennial Review	0.2 PY	Review is a state and federal requirement.
8	Medium	Update regionwide narrative objective for pesticides in surface waters	1.0 PY	Amendments could define exemption criteria for aquatic pesticide use for projects necessary for public health and safety (e.g. vector control).

Draft 2003 Triennial Review Issues for the Lahontan Region (continued)

(Issues are numbered for reference; numbers do not imply recommended priorities within High, Medium, and Low priority categories.)

Contact Judith Unsicker at (530) 542-5462 or JUnsicker@rb6s.swrcb.ca.gov if you have questions about this list.

Issue #	Proposed Priority	Issue	Estimated Resource Needs (PY)¹	Comments
9	Medium	Revise beneficial uses for Paiute Ponds and Amargosa Creek (Los Angeles County)	1.0 PY	Amendments should be deferred until study of groundwater beneath ponds is complete.
10	Medium	Revise beneficial uses for Laurel Pond (Mono County)	1.0 PY	
11	Medium	Remove Municipal and Domestic Supply and Industrial Process Supply beneficial use designations from groundwater at China Lake Air Naval Weapons Station	1.0 PY	May require hydrogeologic studies to delineate aquifer boundaries. Proposed clarification of standards in relation to naturally poor quality waters (Issue 3, above) could eliminate need for site-specific amendments.
12	Medium	Revise beneficial uses for Searles Lake (San Bernardino County)	1.0 PY	Concerns can probably be resolved without the need for amendments.
13	Low	Revise regionwide objective for coliform bacteria to reflect USEPA ² human health criteria for recreational waters	1.5 PY	Current objective is more stringent than USEPA criteria; significant additional monitoring needed to determine background levels in Lahontan Region.
14	Low	Revise regionwide ammonia objective to reflect 1999 USEPA aquatic life criteria	1.0 PY	SWRCB will take the lead on revisions; Regional Board role is currently not clear.
15	Low	Adopt regionwide cadmium objective to reflect USEPA aquatic life criteria	1.0 PY	USEPA is expected to promulgate cadmium criteria as California standards.
16	Low	Add aquatic habitat uses for specific springs and wetlands as recommended by USEPA	1.0 PY	Additional study would be needed to justify changes; existing habitat uses must be protected whether or not formally designated.

Draft 2003 Triennial Review Issues for the Lahontan Region (continued)

(Issues are numbered for reference; numbers do not imply recommended priorities within High, Medium, and Low priority categories.)

Contact Judith Unsicker at (530) 542-5462 or JUunsicker@rb6s.swrcb.ca.gov if you have questions about this list.

Issue #	Proposed Priority	Issue	Estimated Resource Needs (PY) ¹	Comments
17	Low	Revised beneficial uses for Owens Lake (Inyo County)	1.0 PY	Amendments cannot be considered until environmental document for proposed industrial facilities is complete.
18	Low	Revised standards for lower Owens River/Owens Lake in relation to Lower Owens River Project (LORP)	1.0 PY	Environmental Impact Report for LORP still incomplete; final project description and need for amendments are unknown.
19	Low	Designate BIOL ² beneficial use for more waters (e.g., Mojave River riparian areas)	1.0 PY	Existing beneficial uses must be protected whether or not they are formally designated.
		Total Resource Needs for All Issues Above	18.2 PY	Total does not include overhead expenses.
		Total projected planning resources available before next Triennial Review	6.3 PY ³	Total includes overhead expenses.

¹ Resource estimates are for remainder of Fiscal Year (FY) 2003-2004, FY 2004-2005, FY 2005-2006 and early FY 2006-2007; additional resources may be needed for some issues in later fiscal years . PY= “personnel year(s).” PY estimates for each issue are for technical staff time only and do not include overhead.

² Acronyms: NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System; TMDL= Total Maximum Daily Load; USEPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; SWRCB = California State Water Resources Control Board; BIOL = “Preservation of Biological Habitats of Special Significance” beneficial use.

³ This figure assumes continuation of the Regional Board’s FY 2002-2003 baseline funding for basin planning (2.1 PY per fiscal year including overhead).